

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20847

imum wage will increase as our economy will allow it. The hours of work will be reduced, as they have been for years. When I was a boy, it was not unusual to work 54 hours a week—even 60 hours a week. I did so myself. So the hours of work are getting shorter, as our economy allows it.

I hope that we will not seek to solve the problems of automation and the dislocation of workers in the way Mr. Meany suggests. In my judgment, if we did it that way, it would jeopardize the security of the Nation and its success in the struggle for freedom, which demand both maximum productivity and competitiveness, both with the Communist system and within the free world.

If we were to jeopardize productivity and competitiveness, it could bring us to a depression or to such economic troubles as to do us far more harm than the problems of automation.

What we must do is to offer American labor an alternative. This is where we have fallen down badly. The basic way to cope with automation and the job dislocation which results is to prevail on both Government and business to finance jointly the transition of workers into new lines and new places of employment, to provide them with financial aid through periods of automation induced unemployment, and also to facilitate the early retirement of workers nearing the age of retirement. As we realize the fruits of automation, the shorter workweek and higher earnings, including a higher minimum wage, will bring great benefit to the economy because they will have been earned.

I look forward to a gross national product of one thousand billion dollars, perhaps in a decade—against the present \$578 billion, if we can really automate the economy. So the stakes are enormous for the workers, whose real income can almost double in that time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from New York for his thoughtful presentation to the Senate today. He mentioned the large losses of jobs incident to further automation. The figure I have heard is 35,000 a week. Is that about correct?

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct. It has been as high as 40,000.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That shows what a serious problem it is. In my State of Missouri there is heavy unemployment, and yet those unemployed do not have certain skills needed by some of our manufacturers. So I noticed large advertisements of one corporation in my State in the Washington press—and, therefore, I presume in other newspapers in other cities—to get people skilled in the particular professions that particular company needs. I hope the Senator and his colleagues on the committee have plans for developing legislation and presenting it to the Senate that will help meet the problem he has brought up today, educating people so they do not have to go on the dole because of automation.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to my colleague, who is famed in the world of government and also in the world of business—a rather unique union of skills. I value his constructive contribution.

I do have such legislation in mind. I am going to suggest to Senators what must be done to give labor an alternative.

I emphasize that this is not a question of beating Mr. Meany over the head with a stick. He has grave problems, and he must meet them. The only alternative available to him today, apparently, is the shorter workweek. We must provide him with other alternatives. I am confident that American labor, whose traditional policy has not been against automation, will come to that policy again, if we give it a chance.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who is now in the Chamber, has been laboring to have passed a vocational education bill, one of the key elements among the alternatives I have proposed.

We as a nation must resolve to spend the money and expend the effort which is called for. Passage of the tax reduction bill will help. We all expect it to come along. We would like to have had it yesterday, but these are the facts of life.

We need also accelerated vocational training and retraining, which is what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I, and other Senators as conferees, are fighting for.

We also need relocation allowances so that people can move to new locations in search of better jobs.

We need transitional compensation for workers, not on an unemployment basis but on a working basis. After all, this automation-induced unemployment is not something they are inviting for themselves.

We need to provide for the transferability of pension rights, to give labor more mobility. We may need a national pension bank on that score.

We need financial aid for small businesses, to enable them to revamp their enterprises, much like the V-loans after World War II, plus technical assistance to small business.

We need accelerated depreciation and an even newer concept of depreciation allowances than we already have. Even these allowances, which have changed, are still inadequate. They are based on a 10-year concept. We are talking about a much shorter concept today.

We need to revise the antitrust laws, which are, in many cases, out of date. We need to implement the original concept of the Eisenhower administration of establishing national economic goals.

We need greatly to enlarge profit sharing and stock ownership for workers and to give them real ownership in American business.

That is the effective way to deal with automation. Both business and government must participate adequately and effectively.

This morning, for example, we opened hearings on a resolution to establish a Presidential Commission on Automation, suggested by the President's railroad

message; a resolution which I sponsored, together with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and other Senators. The Commission would be charged with the responsibility of coming forward with concrete recommendations, to the President, the Congress, labor, and management.

Labor is right about automation, that it must not be asked to pay the cost, which is a national cost. We can help labor materially to play its traditional role of statesmanship and patriotism in our economy, in regard to automation, by the way we handle the situation and the responsible way we act.

So I say to Mr. Meany, "More power to you. You are jacking us up, and you are telling us what we have to do. What you are proposing is uneconomic and I am not for it, but you cannot be expected to remain quiet and you cannot be expected to do nothing. It is we who have to give you the alternative."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for his statement. I wish to associate myself with him. Early this year he and I introduced a proposal for the appointment of a National Presidential Council on Automation; because, as he and I declared at the time, that probably this is the most important legislative need on the domestic front. I believe most people do not realize what is happening to the economy in connection with automation. I have discussed this subject before. As the Senator from New York knows, this question has been discussed with the President himself. The President, in connection with the railroad bill that he sent up, proposed the creation of such a commission. That went by the boards. I hope that at a very early date legislation can be passed along the lines that the Senator from New York and I proposed months ago, because we are dealing with something that is vital to our economy.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would also associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from New York. The Senator well remembers what happened many years ago. The problem became of national interest under the category of "technocracy." I believe the name of the leader in that field at that time was Scott. Then great prosperity came after the depression of 1932, and then the war years. This temporarily allayed the troubles incident to further automation.

One of the best known leaders of labor made a remark some years ago. When he was shown a machine at the Ford Motor Co., which took a raw casting, drilled it, machined it, ground it, and actually honed it, ready for use, someone said, "A wonderful piece of equipment, don't you think?"

20848

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

November 15

This man replied, "How many Fords will it buy?" I think that remark sums up much of the problem.

Does the study the Senator is interested in involve any examination of the question of moonlighting, which has steadily become a more interesting problem in connection with the shorter hours resulting from automation?

Mr. JAVITS. I should say that, both on the question of economic desirability and necessity, it would be a suitable subject for this kind of study.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BOGGS. I take this opportunity to congratulate the senior Senator from New York for his remarks this morning with reference to Mr. Meany's statement on automation. I wish to associate myself with the views he has expressed. The first step we need to take is to know more about automation. Remarks like those of the Senator from New York will help focus attention throughout the Nation on the importance of knowledge of the problems of automation.

In my own time, I should like to make a few remarks on that subject.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Delaware. I am cognizant of the fact that he has introduced legislation seeking a White House conference on automation. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

WE NEED TO KNOW MORE ABOUT AUTOMATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, in further reference to Mr. Meany's remarks, I should like to mention that we all recognize that he is gravely concerned about the impact of automation on society. He sees automation as devouring jobs and perhaps leading to a national disaster.

I lean more to the view that automation is a mixed blessing—that it has in it the seeds of great good as well as evil. I do emphatically agree with Mr. Meany, however, that something needs to be done to enable the country to cope more realistically with the problem.

Mr. Meany's comments impress upon me again the need for greater public knowledge about automation. I am afraid that to many it conjures up a vision of a mechanical robot taking over and performing humanlike jobs. Actually, automation is much more sophisticated than this, of course, although I do not pretend to understand all or even most of its facets.

We know that automation is affecting now, and will affect in the future, the types of jobs Americans perform. But how are parents to guide their children into future careers without having a better idea of what is happening? How are guidance counselors in our schools to advise students if they do not have a better frame of reference against which to gauge career opportunities?

There is no easy answer to automation. Living with the changes it brings will take the combined efforts of individuals and businesses and all levels of gov-

ernment. But first, before anything constructive can be done, must come a better understanding of the problem itself.

A White House Conference on Automation is not the whole answer to creation of this understanding, I well realize, but I can think of no better single way to accomplish two goals:

First. Investigate the problem on a nationwide basis and, second, spread information about it on a nationwide basis.

A White House Conference would be preceded by local studies. These studies would work up to regional and State conferences. Finally the best ideas would be discussed by well-informed delegates at the Washington, D.C., meeting. Along the way many citizens would be participants in the fact-gathering and idea-generating process. Others would learn from news accounts. The net result would be a far better informed public.

Mr. President, last January I introduced a bill, S. 185, providing for a White House Conference on Automation. I am even more convinced now of the need for such a Conference, and I respectfully urge action on this legislation by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in order that this Conference can take place soon.

ANTISEMITIC CAMPAIGN OF RED RUSSIA AGAINST THE JEWISH PEOPLE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with increasing frequency evidence is appearing of an anti-Semitic campaign now being conducted in Red Russia against the Jewish people. The treatment that is now being accorded to the Jewish minority in Red Russia is cruel, unjust, and unworthy of any government regardless of how base.

The Communists of Red Russia are intent upon destroying the Jewish communities within its boundaries. The evidence is abounding that the Soviet Union is seeking to exterminate the Jews and take from them their lives, properties, and culture. The tragedy is that the Jews of Red Russia are now being not only persecuted and decimated but falsely made the victims for the economic failure and general corruption that prevails in the system.

It goes without saying that I vigorously condemn the persecution to which the Jewish people have been subjected by the Soviet Union; also the extinction of cultural and religious ties between the Soviet Jews and Jews of other lands; the closing of the Jewish synagogues, and the ban against the performance of sacred Jewish rites; the closing of the Jewish schools and the destruction of the Jewish institutions in Yiddish and Hebrew.

Mr. President, I am one of 60 Senators who joined with Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF in sponsoring a pending resolution condemning the Soviet Union for discrimination against the Jews. I make this statement to reaffirm my conviction that the resolution which has been presented is rooted in facts and sound and proper in its condemnation of the brutality and oppression practiced by Red Russia against the Jewish minority.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY IDEA OF CONSPIRACY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, one of the real dangers in any extremist movement is that it threatens the mature discussion of the real issues which confront a nation by responsible members of the liberal and conservative camps. There is much room for disagreement and discussion on the major issues that face us today, but the search for a solution is severely hindered by those who seek to attach their hysterical distortions and untruths to one side or the other.

In the 1930's the far left sought to infiltrate and command the traditional liberal movement in our Nation. Today the far right is attempting to become the voice of conservatism.

The Wyoming State Journal, of Lander, Wyo., carried an excellent column in its November 7 issue outlining the danger to the Nation in the hysterical approach to our problems. The column was written by Perry Swisher. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN BIRCHERS IDEA OF CONSPIRACY IS AGREEMENT

(By Perry Swisher)

Oil discovered on your land doesn't make you a better American than I am—just richer.

If you are successful dogfood manufacturer, that doesn't mean you are man's best friend. In fact, you may have it in your head that there are men who are conspiring to bite you—"Pinks" Socialists, and Communists who must be put on a leash.

And the candymaker who heads the John Birch Society wrote that Dwight Eisenhower probably wasn't the head man to carry out Communist policy in America—more likely Milton Eisenhower was telling his brother what to do. I guess he makes good candy. It's his political philosophy that reeks with rat poison.

The Birch Society's Robert Welch, the dog-food man, and posse of oil-rich gents from the Southwest, are the leading sponsors in the Intermountain States of a campaign to give the voters "a real choice" in 1964. They tell us that for many elections past the Republican and Democratic Parties have been Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

A contest between the American Nazi Party and the Communist Party would represent a real choice. Their mutual hatred is intense enough to satisfy the most bloodthirsty partisan, even if to believers in representative government the authoritarians also look like Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

But that is not the goal. Neither the Nazi balters of minorities nor the Communist haters of capitalists are on our ballots. The object, as I get it, is to make of the Republican Party a conservative party.

This remodeled party, by beating the Nixon and Rockefeller and Eisenhower and Romney and Scranton Republicans in convention, and then defeating the Democrats in November, would save us from the one-world Socialist conspiracy.

Isn't that the pitch? Now, hate is not the hallmark of a conservative. Saying that many, perhaps most, of the men in Congress, the White House, and the U.S. courts are there because they bought the voter with appropriations is not conservatism.

Belief that many or most of these men are stupid enough or evil enough to sell the Nation out to the Communist conspiracy is not a conservative belief.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20849

Saying there is a working conspiracy between Republican and Democratic leaders to deceive the voters while taking orders from foreign masters is not speaking conservatively.

This is hysteria, fear, and the sick that that fear produces. I wonder how long the honorable word "conservative" can stand embrace by political leprosy without losing its health?

To look at the imagined Democratic-Republican conspiracy, let's start at the bottom.

If I vote for a school building bond issue because I have children in school and you vote for it because you own adjoining property or think it will do the town good, we are not conspirators. You may be a conservative on education, I may be a liberal; but when we vote alike we are not conspirators. Nor does it mean one of us has duped the other.

Suppose the State's population increases sharply. Traffic accidents climb.

If both political parties agree more highway patrolmen must be hired, this is no conspiracy. The outs may blame the ins for letting freeway construction lag, or for being unduly influenced by the asphalt peddlers where concrete was called for, but each side calls for stepped-up traffic law enforcement. A conspiracy?

The State may have signed a compact with other States 15 years ago. They exchange students tuition-free in certain specialties, so each State doesn't have to duplicate the other's expensive colleges of medicine, dentistry, etc.

In the process they have spent on education by providing more of it. Both political parties have long since accepted the program though they differ on details. Bipartisan acceptance of the compact doesn't constitute conspiracy, even if the voters never did have a direct vote in the matter.

Agreement, in other words, is not conspiracy. If Republicans and Democrats did not have more in common than in dispute, then I'd worry. With disagreements deep enough and numerous enough, a change of control would become a bloody revolution.

If the Republic is healthy, the quarrel is usually over when, how, and at what expense an action is to be taken. We ought to be in fairly general agreement that the objective is economic well-being and opportunity for as many people as possible, a well-educated citizenry respecting one another's personal freedom, represented by a foreign policy that never sleeps in a round, complicated, and not entirely predictable world.

Those who see some such general American consensus as a conspiracy don't need a political party. They need a doctor.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, during the course of our debate on foreign aid, the distinguished Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] urged and very ably guided through the Senate an amendment which had the effect of cutting off aid to Egypt in order to do something about the precarious situation in which Israel finds herself.

There has been criticism from the White House and AID administrators for that action on the ground that it reduced their flexibility in dealing with these problems. So far as I was concerned,

I supported and voted for the amendment cutting off this flexibility as perhaps one of the things we have to do.

Recently, an article came to my attention which points up the problems we have in the aid field today. For the edification of the Senate, the article should be read. It is written by Henry J. Taylor. It reads in part:

I was in Egypt some years ago when the Washington "big think" bought (taxpayers' money) about 100,000 bales of cotton to butter up wily Gamal Abdel Nasser, a man who has it in him to be a traitor to any cause.

We were trying, as we still are, to win false friends by frail policies and money.

Still reading from the article:

And although this far-off generosity to the hawk-eyed colonel was greatly unappreciated and totally misdirected the added bill knocked our taxpayers for another \$55 million.

Well, these 100,000 bales are now being sold, although prying the particulars out of our foreign aid professors and the U.S. Department of Agriculture was like trying to break the arm of Atlas. The clamp was on in a top directive consistent with the policy of manipulated news. For the man we're selling this cotton to is Nasser.

We paid this Scaramouche a dollar a pound. He's buying it back for less than 35 cents. He's paying \$17.4 million to get back what he sold Uncle Sam for \$55 million.

There is a good deal more in this article which is of real significance in our present debate on foreign aid.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EGYPTIAN COTTON WAS A REAL DEAL

(By Henry J. Taylor)

An inside look at a cotton deal should make us wonder who gets what in foreign aid.

I was in Egypt some years ago when the Washington big think bought (taxpayers' money) about 100,000 bales of cotton to butter up wily Gamal Abdel Nasser, a man who has it in him to be a traitor to any cause.

We were trying, as we still are, to win false friends by frail policies and money.

Responding to the horrendous legends and medieval myths that constitute our farm program, America's warehouses were then, as they still are, bulging with our own unsold cotton.

And although this far-off generosity to the hawk-eyed colonel was greatly unappreciated and totally misdirected, the added bill knocked our taxpayers for another \$55 million.

Well, these 100,000 bales are now being sold, although prying the particulars out of our foreign aid professors and the U.S. Department of Agriculture was like trying to break the arm of Atlas. The clamp was on in a top directive consistent with the policy of manipulated news. For the man we're selling this cotton to is Nasser.

We paid this Scaramouche a dollar a pound. He's buying it back for less than 35 cents. He's paying \$17.4 million to get back what he sold Uncle Sam for \$55 million.

No wonder we're in a heads-you-win-tails-I-lose contest with the tax collector. No wonder most of the world thinks we have more money than brains. And no wonder the whole country, I think, is mentally tired

of trying to figure things out. You just don't get anyplace. Nor do we get the truth, unless sought.

President Kennedy bid for added public approval of the Russian wheat deal by announcing emphatically that all the wheat must be carried in American ships to the extent available. Millions were led to visualize an employment-giving parade of Stars and Stripes across the seas.

Yet Mr. Kennedy knew full well as he spoke that less than one out of four ships would, or could, be American. That's all that are available. Behind the manipulated news this maximum was the real meaning of "to the extent of availability."

Mr. Kennedy also knew, of course, from the advance talks in Canada, that the \$10-a-ton higher American cargo rate would affect even the one out of four. In truth, the actual White House offer is to send only 14 percent in American ships and 86 percent in foreign.

It involves an initial delivery of 2.4 million tons, 23 percent in U.S. vessels, and then the entire balance of the 4 million tons in foreign ships. The Russians haven't introduced any really unexpected obstacles. The American people simply were not told the full truth in the first place. That is what makes the manipulated-news policy so dangerous and unworthy.

Mr. DOMINICK. I point out that this is only one example of the difficulties we face in our foreign aid program. We are constantly finding ourselves at odds. We do one thing for one country, and we find that it acts badly on another country. One country may be an ally, another may be a neutral, and a third may be unfriendly. The more money we put into these areas, the more complex the problems become.

The other day I had the opportunity of commenting on the Indonesian situation. During this process and while referring to the attitude of Mr. Sukarno in connection with the Dutch territories, which he literally forced out of their hands, and his present activities in burning the British Embassy and the British possessions and threatening American possessions, I referred to Mr. Sukarno as a bandit. I am really quite entertained that the Ambassador for Indonesia has made a protest in connection with those remarks of mine against Mr. Sukarno.

I have not heard from the State Department, as to whether they gave any reply. In the process of his objection to the State Department, he apparently also criticized the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for calling Mr. Sukarno a no-good, corrupt man who would be in bed with the Communists were it not for American aid. I understand that the Senator from Oregon replied quite vehemently yesterday; and I agree with the statements that he made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Not vehemently; objectively.

Mr. DOMINICK. I accept the modification.

It might be interesting if we included some comments at this point concerning the history of Mr. Sukarno.

20850

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

November 15

At the same time that Shriver, the Director of the Peace Corps, fought the Japanese during World War II, Sukarno held down an important post with the enemy, that of general political adviser to the Japanese Military Government in Indonesia.

In that post, Sukarno turned 2 million of his countrymen over to the Japanese to be treated, in the words of Maj. Gen. Charles Willoughby, who was our chief of intelligence in that area, "like coolie slaves."

One of Sukarno's chief tasks was to exhort Indonesians into greater war effort: "We shall flatten out America" and "We shall overturn England."

Then he organized a colossal anti-American rally in Djakarta on November 8, 1944. An Indonesian weekly published photographs of Sukarno burning bigger-than-life pictures of Western leaders. A caption under the picture read: "Roosevelt, Churchill Condemned."

In 1945 he jumped from a sinking Japanese ship and joined with the Soviets. He telegraphed Stalin asking support and pledged himself to the ultimate attainment of Russian aspirations.

In 1949 Sukarno became President of the Indonesian republic. He has since guided Indonesian affairs with a flair that has enabled him to win the order of Lenin and to chortle in Djakarta: "This means I am a Communist of the highest order."

There is information to the effect that Sukarno has publicly endorsed the Communist Party of Indonesia as "a genuine participant in the political process and the Nationalist movement." This endorsement has been made concrete by the appointment of large numbers of Communist Party members to the Parliament and to advisory organs of the Government, such as the Supreme Advisory Council and the National Planning Council.

Sukarno has received more than \$1 billion in late-model arms from the Communist world. I might say that a good portion of the finances that he received with which to pay for these arms came from U.S. aid. Sukarno has embraced Mao Tse-tung, and has told listeners of Radio Peiping that he will work with Mao in the joint struggle "to create a world Socialist society," an aim "impossible to realize if imperialism still exists in the world." He has promised support for the Communist campaign to "liberate Formosa from Imperialist lackeys."

That is only a part of his history.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for this documentation on Sukarno. My prediction is that no matter how much aid the United States gives him, he will turn out to be worse than Castro. He is a two-timing politician in Asia who will take everything we give him and then amputate the hand that feeds him. I hope that the administration will recognize that reality and not make the mistake of pouring out additional money for Sukarno. At the present time aid has been suspended

temporarily. It ought to be in perpetuity, because in my judgment here is a place in the world which is headed by a man so corrupt that any money we give him will not help the cause of freedom, but will be used to carry out his diabolical purposes.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate very much the feelings, comments, and remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. All we have to do is to look at recent history; we do not have to go to past history, except, as I said, to lay the background for it.

When he moved into West New Guinea, governed by the Dutch, who wanted to give the right of self-determination to more than 500,000 people, the Papuans, what did we do? Did we support the Dutch in their effort to extend self-determination to these people, a principle which we have so long professed as one of our guiding principles? We did not. We backed Sukarno, and we told the Dutch, in order to create peace in that area, they should get out. With no support, and inability to use our bases, to reinforce their troops in the area, the Dutch did get out. Sukarno has taken over this territory, and these people have been taken over, without any hope of self-determination, and without any hope of redress for any wrongs which may have been committed in that area.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I commend the Senator from Colorado for his very correct interpretation of what has happened and on his extremely useful summing up of some of the follies that we have committed in Indonesia. That is the only way I can describe them. They were follies. We have supported a ruthless dictator and unscrupulous aggressor. His principles are in direct opposition to ours. He acted ruthlessly in moving to take over West New Guinea when that situation should have been left to the future decision of the people themselves. That area which the Dutch did not wish to retain themselves, although it had been a Dutch colony, should have been turned over to the United Nations under some kind of trusteeship or mandate, so that in the future, when those people had reached the point where they knew what they wanted, they could decide what status or political association they desired to have.

That would have been the proper policy for the United States to support. We yielded to Sukarno's bludgeoning tactics, for reasons that are difficult to justify. We allowed Sukarno to take those people over. The Senator from Colorado has performed a very useful service in the statement he has made.

Mr. DOMINICK. I very much appreciate the support of the distinguished Senator from Alaska. Obviously, from comments which have been made here, there are opinions concerning Mr. Sukarno that are strong opinions and which are based on a historical position as to what he has been doing. When I referred to Mr. Sukarno as a bandit, it is

interesting to note that one of the definitions of a bandit is one who takes unfair advantage over others, usually to procure inordinate payment or profit.

If that is not an accurate description of what he has been doing, not only in his own country and at the expense of his own people, who are fine people for the most part, but also in other places in that area, including west New Guinea and Malaysia, which he is now trying to break up, and including West Irian, and other places which he is trying to seize and hold onto, then I do not know what that word means. I have no intention on the floor of the Senate to back down from such a description of Mr. Sukarno.

JOURNALISM BY INVECTIVE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Washington Post seems to be most unhappy about the reforms that have been made in the Senate in the foreign aid bill in the course of a 3-week debate.

Let me state my belief that these reforms have been constructive, needed, and desirable in every sense of the word, and should go far to improve, revitalize, rehabilitate, and save the foreign aid program. This program was rapidly falling apart both in its execution and in the estimation of an increasing number of the American people. Not only has no damage been done to the program, but the amendments adopted should substantially strengthen it.

As far as the quantitative cuts are concerned, they are unimportant. There is still more than \$6½ billion in the "pipeline," which, for the benefit of the public means that that amount of money is the sum left over from previous appropriations which has been unexpended. Therefore, if not one cent had been authorized or appropriated by this Congress, the program could have gone on for a year and a half or nearly 2 years without difficulty. Moreover, a country-by-country approach would show that the total authorization could be cut further without impairment of the program.

And yet we find in the leading editorial of today's Washington Post, entitled "Sermon on Aid," the following characterizations.

This has been, the Post says, a "bitter" fight over foreign aid. Note the adjective "bitter."

In the next paragraph, the Post says that what Congress has done to the aid program is, in its opinion, "wrong and foolish." The Congress has carved the bill to the marrow. Anatomically speaking, the marrow is the inside of the bone. Actually, Congress barely nicked the epidermis.

Further, the Senate has "implanted a series of dogmatic restrictions." Note the word "dogmatic." And Congress apparently has been guilty of "spiteful use of aid as a club." Note the adjective "spiteful" and the noun "club."

The Post notes that the congressional "onslaught was not simply the act of a small and willful minority." I am glad that the Post recognizes that constructive amendments were adopted by majority vote—as they obviously would have to be—and that in the case of some of